



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,949	02/19/2002	Ebrahim Zandi	064189-0501	6542
38706	7590	09/14/2010		
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 975 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 94304				
EXAMINER				
PROUTY, REBECCA E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1652				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/14/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10079949	2/19/2002	ZANDI ET AL.	064189-0501

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
975 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 94304

EXAMINER

Rebecca E. Prouty

ART UNIT	PAPER
1652	910

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 9/3/10 has been entered and considered. However a single highly misleading statement by appellants within the reply brief needs to be addressed herein. On pages 10-11 of the reply brief appellants imply that an additional step of activating the expressed IKK complex with added NIK must necessarily be done following separation of the inactivated IKK protein complex and thus the examiner is changing the recited steps. This not correct. The additional step of lysis and addition of NIK could clearly be inserted immediately following the step of growing the yeast (i.e., step 2 as recited on page 10) and prior to the step of separating the substantially homogenous, biologically functional and activated IKK protein complex (i.e., step 3 as recited on page 10). Thus the examiner's suggested method is clearly within the scope of the recited method and does NOT alter any of the recited steps of the claim. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

/Rebecca E. Prouty/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1652